



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/044,691	01/10/2002	David D. Crouch	PD-01W080	9703

7590 10/03/2003
William J. Benman, Esq.
2049 Century Park East, Ste. 2740
Los Angeles, CA 90067

EXAMINER

WONG, ERIC K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2874

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/044,691

Applicant(s)

CROUCH ET AL.

Examiner

Eric Wong

Art Unit

2874

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 15 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10, 16 and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8-9 and 11-14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). 4
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1-5, 10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 5,776,612 to Fisher.

As to claims 1 and 17, Fisher discloses in figures 2-6:

- An apparatus for reflecting an incident millimeter-wave beam comprising:
 - A first layer of dielectric material adapted to receive and partially transmit said incident millimeter-wave beam and
 - One or more layers of dielectric materials disposed in alignment with said first layer, each additional layer being such that transmitted waves substantially cancel in the forward direction.

Art Unit: 2874

As to claim 2-5, the layers are optically transparent and made of dielectric materials including sapphire and air.

As to claim 10, the apparatus includes a sealed housing (Column 7, Lines 44-47).

As to claim 16, it would be inherent that device as rejected in claim 1, would require the method claimed to produce such an apparatus.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher as applied to claim 1 above.

Fisher discloses an apparatus for reflecting millimeter wave beams, but fails to explicitly disclose seven sapphire layers and six layers of air between said sapphire layers, nor a thickness of said layers.

One skilled in the art would have been able to add or remove the number of layers and adjust the thickness of said layers in order to adapt the apparatus to reflect at different variable parameters.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify Fisher to include more layers and a certain thickness to perform in a variety of incident millimeter wave beam intensities.

Claim Objections

5. Claims 8-9 and 11-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The prior art made of record fails to explicitly disclose or reasonably suggest vented spacers in a sealed housing filled with gas with input and exhaust ports.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claim 15 is allowable, as it has overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 set forth in the previous office action. The prior art made of record fails to explicitly disclose or reasonably suggest a sealed housing with a gas fill port, a gas exhaust port, and baffles for directing gas flow.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 06/17/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In page 6, line 9; applicant states that no basis was given for the rejection on claim 16. It is pointed out however that on 3 of the first office action in line 10, reasons for rejection of claim 16 is given.

8. In page 7, paragraph 2 and 4; applicant argues that the invention substantially cancels beams in the forward direction. Fisher discloses multiple layers that serve to substantially cancel beams in the forward direction. Each beam that passes through the first layer is cancelled by the next and so on. The prior art meets all limitations included in the claims.

Art Unit: 2874

9. In paragraph 3, applicant argues that Fisher absorbs microwave energy and does not reflect it. While this is true, it is not claimed that no absorption is taking place. Therefore the limitations of the claim have been met.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric Wong whose telephone number is 703-305-4741. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 830AM - 430PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rodney Bovernick can be reached on 703-308-4819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

Art Unit: 2874

EW


HEMANG SANGHAVI
PRIMARY EXAMINER